UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Case of Bishop Barnes - - - - - - *F. H. Amphlett Micklewright*

Niebuhr Boiled Down for Liberals - - - - - - - - *Gardner Williams*

Political Action for Birth Control - - - - - - - - - - *John Malick*

When the Chips Are Down - - - - - - - - - - *John W. Brigham*

Declaring for Color and Resigning from a Myth - - - - - - - - *Kenneth L. Patton*

The Promise of Human Nature: Discipline or Love? - - - - - - - - *John W. Cyrus*

Religion Versus the History of Religion - - - - - - - - - *Edmund A. Opitz*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXIII NUMBER 5

Chicago, November-December, 1947

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

John W. Brigham: Minister of The First Unitarian Church in Sioux City, Iowa.

John W. Cyrus: Minister of The First Unitarian Church of Omaha, Nebraska.

C. A. Hawley: Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kansas.

John Malick: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Duluth, Minnesota.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright: Minister of Cross St. Chapel, Manchester, England.

Edmund A. Opitz: Minister of the Second Parish in Hingham, South Hingham, Massachusetts.

Kenneth L. Patton: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin.

Gardner Williams: Professor of Philosophy, University of Toledo.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 83

ARTICLES—

The Case of Bishop Barnes—F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT .. 84

Niebuhr Boiled Down for Liberals—GARDNER WILLIAMS 85

Political Action for Birth Control—JOHN MALICK 86

When the Chips Are Down—JOHN W. BRIGHAM 90

Declaring for Color and Resigning from a Myth—KENNETH L. PATTON 92

The Promise of Human Nature: Discipline or Love?—JOHN W. CYRUS 94

Religion Versus the History of Religion—EDMUND A. OPITZ 96

THE STUDY TABLE—

Two Great Writers for All Mankind—C. A. HAWLEY 98

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 99

THE FIELD—

Gandhi and War—*Worldover Press* 82

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Gandhi and War

"My reference to the possibility of war between the two sister dominions seems, I am told, to have produced a scare in the West. I do not know what reports are sent outside by newspaper correspondents. Summaries are always a dangerous enterprise except when they truly reflect the speaker's opinion. An unwarranted summary of a pamphlet I had written about South Africa in 1896 nearly cost me my life. It was so hopelessly unwarranted that within 24 hours of my being lynched (sic), European opinion in South Africa turned from anger into contrition that an innocent man was made to suffer through no fault he had committed. The moral I wish to be drawn from the foregoing version is that no one should be held responsible for what he has not said or done.

"I hold that not a single mention of war in my speeches can be interpreted to mean that there was any incitement to, or approval of, war between Pakistan and India, unless mere mention of it is to be taboo. We have amongst us a superstition that the mere mention of a snake ensures its appearance in the house wherein mention is made even by a child. I hope no one in India entertains such a superstition.

"I claim I rendered a service to both the sister states by examining the present situation and definitely stating when a cause for war could arise between the two states. This was done not to promote war but to avoid it as far as possible. I endeavored to show that if insensate murders, loot, and arson by people are continued they would force the hands of their Governments. Was it wrong to draw public attention to the logical steps that inevitably followed one after another?

"India knows and the world should know that every ounce of my energy has been and is being directed to the definite avoidance of fratricide culminating in war. Such is my fundamental position from which I hope never to swerve even to the day I die."

—*Worldover Press.*

UNITY

Volume CXXXIII NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1947 No. 5

EDITORIAL

Violation of the principles of democracy anywhere is bad, and violation in the national capital is especially bad. The eyes of the world are on democratic America, and they focus on the capital city. When Negroes cannot be housed and fed in the chief hotels and restaurants of Washington, when Negro physicians cannot attend Negro patients in a public hospital where more than half of the patients are Negroes, and when Negro children are discriminated against even in marble tournaments, it is high time for indignant citizens to demand a housecleaning in the management of the District of Columbia.

The Report of the President's Civil Rights Commission has highlighted the importance of civil rights in democratic society, named defects in our practice, and recommended specific improvements in law and procedure. The Report has received a good press and radio response. Municipal, state, and Federal bodies should study the Report with diligence and take its recommendations seriously. It should have priority in the program of clubs, forums, and civics classes in the schools. Members of the bar, legislators, and public officials should give it special attention. Citizens who believe in democracy and respect human rights should be shocked by its revelations and activated by its recommendations. There is no excuse in America for wholesale violation of basic liberties. An awakened public should demand that our precious civil rights be respected, and that violators of them be branded as public enemies. It is high time for American practice to be brought abreast of the American creed of equality and justice under law. Specific steps to do this are recommended by the Commission: The power of the Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice should be strengthened; there should be a permanent Civil Rights Commission in the Executive Office of the President; and there should be a joint Standing Committee of the House and the Senate charged with the duty of protecting civil rights. The Commission recommends, also, anti-poll tax and anti-lynching laws, a Federal FEPA, and laws guaranteeing equality of treatment in public services. The recommendations of the Commission are in accord with the best American tradition, they are reasonable, and they are practical. The Congress and the State Legislatures should swing into action without delay in the homefront battle for democratic liberty under law.

America may be embarrassed by the report to the United Nations on the Negro situation in the United States, but it will be a well-deserved embarrassment. We have been too careless in our practice of democracy at home while fighting for its extension abroad. Great gains have been made in recent years, but we are still far from any thoroughgoing practice of democracy on the level of race. We would be well advised to make no effort to justify our practice before the forum of world opinion. It would be better to confess our faults, point out our attainments and improvements, and pledge ourselves to more zealous devotion to the American creed of equality. Any effort to underestimate the significance of the DuBois document would be a mistake. On the contrary, it should be given the widest possible publicity. America cannot fulfill its world mission while 10 per cent of the population do not participate fully in the benefits of American life. Democracy means all the people; it does not mean 90 per cent of the people.

All of the groups and peoples of the world who are oppressed and discriminated against should be given a full and fair hearing before the proper unit of the United Nations. When they cannot speak for themselves, let others speak for them. The oppressed Negroes of America, the displaced persons of Europe, the Untouchables of India, the slave laborers of Russia, the coolies of China, the natives of South Africa—let them all come, let their chains rattle on the doorsteps and their cries be heard in the halls of the Assembly of the Nations, until nightmares haunt the sleep of statesmen everywhere and the world is aroused to the importance of freedom and justice for all men.

Curtis W. Reese.

The Case of Bishop Barnes

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

A sensation has been caused in English religious circles. The Archbishop of Canterbury, head of the state church, supported by the Archbishop of York, has made a public request to the Bishop of Birmingham that he resign his diocese and cease to officiate as a bishop of the Church of England. No debate has taken place officially and the two archbishops are agreed that there shall be no legal proceedings. Dr. Barnes of Birmingham is well known on both sides of the Atlantic as a Modernist leader and has been a thorn in the flesh of the orthodox Anglicans for many years. His sympathies have been shown constantly to all who adopt radical views in theology and progressive pacifist attitudes in politics. Recently, he published a work on Christian origins, *The Rise of Christianity,* which set out to expound a non-miraculous and naturalistic view of the beginnings of the Christian movement. In his Preface, he makes a categorical avowal of his own belief in the divinity of Jesus but he goes on to show that his interpretation of this divinity is moral and spiritual. His view of Jesus is far removed from that of a miracle-worker and insists that any Christianity of the future must come to terms with science and must eschew the older miraculous beliefs. In substance, the book owes a great deal to Guignebert and to the more advanced critics of modern France not excluding Loisy, a scholar badly underrated in England. It is significant that no attempt to refute the book itself has come from church circles and that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, both of whom are more distinguished as administrators than as theologians or historians, have relied entirely upon the method of censure. Orthodox church opinion is behind the archbishops, but, at the same time, liberal opinion in the press is more than a little sympathetic to Dr. Barnes. In the Miscellany column of the *Manchester Guardian,* the famous liberal newspaper, appeared a note which did not look with too kindly an eye upon ecclesiastical autocracy, whilst the editor of the *New Statesman and Nation,* speaking from a somewhat agnostic viewpoint, is clearly inclined to defend the heretical bishop. The whole incident is significant of the wide breach growing up in England between the credal churches and enlightened public opinion generally.

During recent years, the Church of England has not shown much taste for the heresy trials, such as that of Bishop Colenso, which convulsed the middle years of the last century. Bishops have relied far more upon freezing out the recalcitrant priest. Early in this century, Bishop Gore, the famous high churchman, froze out the late Reverend C. E. Beeby for denying the reality of the virgin birth. In 1911, the Dean of Divinity at Magdalen College, Oxford, the Reverend J. M. Thompson, was likewise frozen out for publishing a work, *Miracles of the New Testament,* which challenged traditional interpretations. A few modernist clergymen have been thrust aside from time to time. But, on the whole, lip-service has been paid to Anglican inclusiveness. At the same time, the war with the subsequent vast national lapse from churchgoing has had the effect of causing the orthodox ranks to close. The Anglican attitude upon such matters as the remarriage of divorced persons in church has stiffened to the point of exclusion. Looking upon itself as "a citadel of hope set on the edge of despair," the Church has become less and less tolerant of doctrinal divergencies. So far as religion in England is concerned, the contest between the archbishops and Dr. Barnes is significant of the strict assertion of orthodoxy, unaccompanied by argument, which is coming to symbolize the attitude of the Church of England and certain of the Free Church bodies. As such, it is worthy of attention upon both sides of the Atlantic, symbolizing the straits into which theological orthodoxy has drifted in a critical age.

The dispute between the Bishop of Birmingham and the Archbishop of Canterbury must be far more than a domestic matter for the Church of England. As the National Church, the Church of England has sought in theory to be broad and inclusive, tolerating wide diversities of opinion within its borders. In the past, it has known and honored men of advanced High Church opinions side by side with those of the Broad Church party and Evangelicals and, in his pronouncement before the House of Bishops, the Archbishop of Canterbury paid tribute to this fact. Yet, when a diocesan bishop, far advanced in scholarship and culture beyond the majority of the episcopate, puts the matter to the test, he lays himself open to a heavy censure without reasonable opportunities of reply or of debate. Even the opportunities of a trial for heresy are apparently to be denied to him. It cannot be said that ecclesiastical conduct of this type is in accord with twentieth century ideals of justice; on the contrary, it seems to belong to the procedure of a somewhat remote age. At the same time, a national church claiming international affiliations must expect the interest and concern of citizens at large both in America and in England. It is a curious comment on the incident that no Free Church minister could be treated in this way before his denominational assembly and be refused the liberty of discussion.

The origins of the dispute, as has been stated, are to be found in Dr. Barnes' book, *The Rise of Christianity.* It is a work of clear-headed scholarship, lucidly written, which seeks to point out the vast changes that have taken place during recent years in this field. Writings such as those of Kirsopp Lake, Guignebert, or Loisy are laid heavily under contribution. The bishop is clearly aware of the tendencies of certain recent investigations in the field of New Testament studies and of the need for their objective treatment. His book has come as a shock to the majority of church people because they were kept wholly unaware of the drift of contemporary scholarship in this field. It cannot be said that the bulk of churchmen writing or speaking upon the subject were willing to attempt any sort of objective approach. Dr. Barnes has discerned with a clearness due to his scientific training the real point of departure from past ages, including those within which the New Testament stories took their present shape. They were ages of miracle when unknown or strange happenings were attributed to supernatural causes. The mental climate has changed and the age of miracle has given way to the reign of law discerned by scientific investigation. As Dr. Barnes pointed out, whenever religion has found itself in contest with science during the present century, it is science which has conquered. Religion has then fought with the antiquated weapon of miracle in an age which can lay open to investigation the natural causes and origins of the miracle-stories. Its defeat cannot therefore be a matter for surprise.

The true failure of the Archbishop lies in his refusal to discern the obvious fact that the steady rejection of miracle has not meant the death of religion in itself but has spelt the rise of a purified religious faith capable of relating itself to the data provided by a scientific universe.

Spiritual things must be spiritually discerned, as the Archbishop of Canterbury remarked during his speech of censure. But this can only mean that faith is a qualitative judgment. It is not the quantity of things believed but the quality of the faith exhibited which really matters for religion. Throughout Dr. Barnes' book is a loyal discipleship of the Jesus whom he accepts as divine. The argument which the Archbishop brings forward as condemning the animus of the book in fact turns in upon itself. Nor is it possible to place much weight upon the claim that Dr Barnes' position only represents the attitude of a few extreme critics. On the contrary, the conclusions reached concerning the rise of Christianity have been known to scholarship for some years. Gradually a picture is emerging of a Christian revolution brought about by the figure of Jesus of Nazareth and in the light of his religious genius but which came into being through natural means and to which legend and devotion attached stories of miracle and wonder. Exactly the same process took place up to a point with St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Francis of Assisi and many others on the calendar of saints. It is this crucial and acid scholarship concerning historical details with which an honest orthodoxy must come to terms in the years ahead. If it fails to do so, it will only succeed in detaching from organized religion persons with any real claim to mental culture. Perhaps it is not without significance that Dr. Barnes is the only Doctor of Science and Fellow of the Royal Society on the bench of bishops!

But there is another matter which deserves to be noticed. No like incident has taken place since the condemnation of Bishop Colenso of Natal eighty years ago. Colenso was ostracized by the Anglican bishops of his day for denying the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and for pressing upon the notice of the Church the more advanced positions in Old Testament studies. Time has done much to justify the conclusions which he then put forward. Most scholarly churchmen would now accept similar positions without question, and his opponent, Archbishop Gray of Capetown, is entirely forgotten. Perhaps time, and an increasing knowledge of New Testament scholarship, will work a similar revenge for Dr. Barnes! But, for the historian, the Colenso case is particularly unpleasant because the incriminated bishop was given no proper right of reply and the matter was decided by ecclesiastical discipline rather than by scholarly investigation. Colenso was invited to resign his see and, when he refused to do so, was subjected to petty spite for the rest of his life. It is not a pleasant fact that much the same procedure has been adopted in the case of Dr. Barnes. He is not to be allowed the investigations of scholarship or a proper discussion of the subjects under dispute. An ecclesiastical censure, whether or not it is supported by a full knowledge of the scholarship in debate, is sufficient to settle the matter and appeal is thereby made from the archiepiscopal throne to the more fanatical type of churchman. For the man of today, the whole affair will suggest a vast anachronism. All of the appurtenances of a former age are present to deal with the heretic, save the power of the Church to execute its desire. The modern man is not likely to waste much time by being puzzled at the spectacle. He is more likely to turn aside, disgusted and ashamed.

For the Unitarian and others who hold fast to the reality of a liberal religious faith as a dynamic within life, the whole dispute will possess at least one saddening feature. It is merely likely to breed further cynicism and despair so far as the forces of organized religion are concerned. Many will assume that it is Canterbury or nothing. Others will recall that the incriminated bishop, like his distant predecessor of Natal, stands almost alone among the English episcopate in his care for social progress and in his demands that the Christian ethic should be applied to the problems of war. It may well be by these things that his true loyalty to his Master is to be judged. Unitarians came to the defense of Bishop Colenso many years ago because they saw in his battle their own struggle for religious liberty. In the same way, Dr. Barnes is today striving for the right of a free religious faith to disentangle itself from those elements which would inhibit its progress in the twentieth century. Whether or not he can do so most aptly in the Church of England is a minor matter to be decided by himself alone. The true issue is one of religious liberty and its rights in the face of an autocratic ecclesiastical orthodoxy, the mentality which has possessed the Barthian as well as the Anglican. Unitarians of today, side by side with other religious liberals, will do well to see their own cause mirrored in the struggles of Dr. Barnes. They are significant of an age when religious freedom has once again to struggle in all of the churches throughout the world for its rights of self-expression.

Niebuhr Boiled Down for Liberals

GARDNER WILLIAMS

Reinhold Niebuhr's philosophy is based on the truths that human life is in some measure incurably tragic, that man can never attain perfection, and that all conduct falls short of the ideal. Human behavior ought to be perfect, but it never is. Therefore, says Niebuhr, all of it is wrong. Really, all of it is only partly wrong. But, briefly, all of it is wrong. Therefore, we are told, God condemns the whole human enterprise. Therefore we should all feel guilty and contrite. Contrition means that we are sorry and will try not to do it again. Then we always do it again, so we should keep on feeling guilty and contrite all the time, perhaps more and more all the time if divine grace does not enter in. But if we come around to a right-wing Calvinistic church regularly, divine grace will probably be freely available. There we may learn about the foregoing and, by grace, succeed in living more consistently, confidently, serenely, and humanely. One gathers from Mr. Niebuhr's writings that there is no other way to avoid living improperly and being terribly downhearted.

However, we should observe, for one thing, that some supposedly right-wing Calvinistic churches do not teach

this doctrine. Some teach the Gospels with a few non-Niebuhrian elaborations.

And if they do go Niebuhrian, what then? Then they tell us that God is in a state of open or suppressed wrath against us all the time because we act in accordance with the presumptuous natures which he has given us. He demands of us a love which is an utter self-abnegation, which it is utterly impossible for us to practice, and which he himself does not even try to practice. The Niebuhrian philosophy holds that believing this is the only adequate spiritual support we can find. Without it we shall stagger through life in either a mild or an aggravated form of manic-depressive insanity, alternating between moods of frantic hope and of devastating disillusionment.

Niebuhr's religion aims at breaking our pride and undermining our self-reliance. He thinks that we are all sinfully arrogant and presumptuous in nearly everything we do, and especially in our highest spiritual achievements. He wants to humble us by giving us a chronic sense of guilt. Such spiritual slavishness produces contrition, which, he thinks, produces poise.

It may work out so for a few people, but surely Niebuhr is not psychologically sound for humanity at large. His is no general rule for a sane and wholesome existence. Most people who succeed in living self-respecting and socially useful lives do it in other ways. This myth that he narrates is not inspiring. The life it recommends reeks with the stinking sweat of spiritual self-abasement and with the chronic corruption of a festering conscience that is ever reinfected by remorse at each natural, positive, voluntary act. Compare Niebuhr's *Reflections on the End of an Era,* p. 296, where he says that humanistic moral striving "generates a stinking sweat of self-righteousness." While Niebuhr is dealing in myths and can make them anything he likes, why not make them really inspiring and helpful to the bulk of humanity? Why not rely on sound psychological principles?

The reason why Mr. Niebuhr does not do so is probably that merely to help people live sanely is not his ultimate aim. To help them do this is one of his goals, but it is not his main objective. His prime purpose is to make men live sanely under the guidance of orthodox Calvinistic Protestantism, in whose service he is now having such a brilliant career. Thus his humanitarianism is sharply limited by a provincial sectarianism. His propaganda aims at persuading humanity to come around on Sunday and huddle under the right wing of orthodox Calvinism.

He speaks for simple faith, but the people of simple faith whom I have known, and who have heard or read Mr. Niebuhr, tell me that they cannot understand his philosophy. Those who can understand it ought to be able to understand it well enough to be immune to it.

Political Action for Birth Control

JOHN MALICK

Keeping just the right number of one's kind is difficult for every kind of life. We are the only kind that knows anything about it. Nature provided for a large margin of eggs, sometimes millions of them, so that although most are destroyed some bring new life to birth. The next stage improved the situation very much, putting the egg inside to develop instead of leaving millions lying around loose. This is as far as life has gone, putting the egg inside. We belong to this kind.

Whatever the purpose of life is, it took no chances on these different kinds dying out. The plan is on generous proportions. Almost any kind can fill up the whole place with its own in a short time. It is estimated that some forms could very soon fill the sea, go on to fill space as large as the sun and even as large as the known universe. This rate of increase is mathematically computable. English sparrows could very soon have one to every square inch. We can do it, too. Up to 150 years ago it seems that the population had continued about the same for a million years, 850,000,000 people. Then our kind took a spurt. In some places the population doubled in 25 years. It would not take long to put four men on every square yard.

Population control is part of the larger subject of the relation of the sexes. One of the major discoveries of the human race, made comparatively recently, is that offspring come as a result of mating the sexes. Before this fact was discovered the male was just an extra, of no known use hanging around the camp. He would go hunting but he would not bring in the wood. It was not known that he had anything to do with the birth of children.

Life made this urge to propagate the strongest of a half dozen major urges and gave it the greatest satisfaction. This keeps life from dying out. Few even yet of our kind would carry on the race from a sense of duty and moral obligation. This urge to propagate seems to be as old as life itself. Freud did not invent it. He only discovered it. This urge curiously enough is strongest in the human race. While all forms of life have it, they have along with it the ingrained habit of mating only for offspring. We hear the sex habits of animals commended to us for imitation and called virtue. It is not virtue at all. If they have no sex vices neither do they have sex virtues. What they do they are bound to do by a law of their being that is as much out of their control and choice as is the sap rising in the spring and the leaves dropping in the fall.

The human race is the only form of life in which mating of sexes has any other purpose than offspring. The procreative urge is said to be not so strong among primitive people. Contrary to the popular impression they did not wallow in sexual excess. This urge is not as strong in them as in more civilized people among whom it sometimes has run riot. It is said to be stronger in domestic than in wild animals. Primitive people really had to stimulate this urge artificially. They made an orgy of the adolescent initiation into the tribe. They deliberately stimulated, with their ceremonies, the desire of man and maid for each other. When the ceremonies were over the youth were mated. That is, this urge was sluggish and it was a part of their religion to stimulate it. The major difference between popular religion now and then is that early people encouraged sex activity, even made it a virtue

of religion and even a part of their kind of religious service. The emphasis of religion for centuries in the Western Hemisphere has been to shame sex activity out as irreligious and sinful. As a result of this situation among primitive people, excess population was not so much of a problem with them. They did not have large families. Tribal customs were adamant on this, limiting the family to two or three children. The wrong impression we have comes from comparing primitive people with the crowded people of our slums, among whom the birth rate may be high.

But getting too many people around, it seems always has been a problem, and they always have done something about how many children were to be born, or if born how many were to survive. It was so long ago, lost in the mist of antiquity, that we do not know just their method, but they must have done something for they could easily have overstocked their territory. They had no way to increase food production and had no fast freight to bring it from other places. They had to work it out and it was a matter of life or death. We are rich enough to leave it to individual choice how many children people have. They were too poor to allow such freedom. We are the first people that can produce food in quantity.

Obviously, control can come in at either of two points. It can come in before the new life comes into being. This prevents anything developing that would be a human being when born. Stopping at the first stage and disposing of life any time between conception and birth always have been difficult and dangerous. It is not likely that primitive people could do it. All they could do was to wait and do something to life after it was born. They did not know what to do to keep it from being born. They had to keep a balance between their food and their number. They did this in two ways: infanticide and making way with old people. Their tribal ways and what conscience they had at the time approved both of these ways. Infants had to be disposed of quite soon after birth or the parents would run into their punishments for murder. Infanticide was the better of the two, ending life before it knew it was here and what it would miss by dying. Old people did know and were conscious of what was done to them. Infanticide was not really birth control or birth prevention. It was disposing of the product after all the steps up to birth had been gone through. Infanticide was such a general practice that the normal was the mother who had disposed of a half dozen infants. Infanticide presupposes a short food situation and a certain kind of conscience to go with it. Christianity put a theological penalty on it and in time developed a conscience that was troubled about it. The church made it murder to take life after birth, then went still farther back with the murder charge making it murder to dispose of the life any time before birth. The church went back even farther than this, making it a sin to prevent the life from coming into being. That could not be murder, for as yet there was no being in existence to make way with. All the church could do was call it sin of first magnitude and get the state to make it a crime.

One's attitude on population regulation depends upon what one has in his mind and where he got it. He may have in mind that having all the children possible is high virtue, and limiting the number is sin. There is of course a physical limit to the number any person can be the mother of, but that number is quite high. This subject is not only a part of the larger subject of sex relations but it is also a subhead of the general subject, emancipation of women.

All that pertains to birth control runs into what the average mind is stuffed with by those who have done practically all the stuffing up to this time, viz., religionists. Most that people think they know about it is said to be Biblically grounded. However this is, it is reinforced by fanciful theological speculation. To show how far we are back on this matter we still run into this, that increasing and multiplying is a divine command and you do it, or else, because you were told to by the Highest Up. It is said that you cannot go back of this. There are two commands to this effect, one when there were just two people in the world, in the Garden of Eden story. The other time that this command to increase and multiply was given was when there were only eight people in the world, Noah's family when they came out of the Ark after the Flood. Both of these are interesting myths. They have no higher standing than this in the field of Biblical scholarship or in informed circles of religionists. It would be one thing to say, "Increase and Multiply," in a world of eight people, and it would be something else entirely to say it when the number of people had reached terrifying proportions. Whatever Jehovah did say when there were only eight, it would be beyond any stupidity recorded of Him to think that He would say it now. Not knowing His mind, we give Him the benefit of the doubt, and venture that likely He would say through Mrs. Sanger, one of his later prophets, that the thing for Great Britain and Europe to do now is to declare a moratorium on having children. It does seem sheer idiocy to try to feed Europe with them having all the children they can have, which is a lot of children. Her advice is taken as a threat to our precious morality instead of the most obvious common sense that it is, one little ray of sanity shot through our collective insanity on this subject of irresponsibly filling the world with children while it is in the present condition.

We have the church inheritance on this matter. Whether a woman shall have a child at all and when, is certainly her affair. She is the only one who has the right to say who the father is to be and the only one who really knows who the father is. This obvious right of choice that belongs to her alone, she generally has not had. In this most personal and intimate matter she has not had the final word. We speak of one's right to be his own man. She never has had the right to be her own woman. She has come successively under various masters, matriarchs, patriarchs, husbands, brothers, legal and religious systems. She did not have a chance. We do not have to ask where people got their special angle on this subject. In our half of the world we know they got it from Greek Orthodox, Roman, or Protestant churches.

It is generally known now that Christianity was named for Christ and made by Paul. There is no evidence in the record that the Founder of Christianity had complexes or inhibitions on this subject. His assocation with women, respectable and not, is a model of directness and understanding unique in Western history. It is from Paul that the idea stems that sex relations at all are a concession to the biological urge that produces offspring. This urge to him was about the uncleanest thing in an unclean world. His counsel of perfection is not to be in wedlock except as a com-

promise on the second best. That is, his counsel of perfection was race suicide. Protestants took their leading direct from Paul whose relations with women must have been very unpleasant. At any rate in all his theology, and he made a lot of it, which took the Western Hemisphere, he gave women only a low second place. The irony of history is that women have become the chief support of the very institution that has never given them any part in the management, and put the stamp of approval of religion upon their subjection. Paul's position was reinforced by Augustine who made original sin the basis of Christian theology, and sex the gist of original sin. Sex has as large a place in Augustine as in Freud. Augustine's position is based upon a myth while Freud's is scientifically based. Augustine himself had been pretty much of a sex free-lance until his conversion. At that time he got the impurity complex which has dominated Christian theology ever since. At the time of the Reformation Luther made no material change. He did weaken on the belief in celibacy, the blessedness of the unmarried state. The Reformation left the matter at this point: marriage is a concession made in exchange for willingness to have an indefinite number of children. This position took Germany and the Scandinavian countries.

The opposition to birth control comes now from those operating entirely outside of their field of knowledge. It is that churchmen purport to know more about it than the doctors. Those who know most about how we function physically are for it. Some doctors are forced to oppose it or get off the hospital staff. We suppose that it is never the medical side of the doctor that opposes it. He may go through the motions of trying to oppose it scientifically. This is the church side of him rather than the doctor side. People want it when they know about it. When you hand people such a discovery as this with all the promised benefit in delivering from fear, worry, pain, and the expense of more children, most people naturally, if left to themselves, would take it as the gift it is and thank whatever gods they have. It is a monstrous situation that they can be made to believe that it is a temptation of the devil. When a theological speculation meets a scientific fact, the speculation is bound to lose. It always has and always should. Any religion that does not take a scientific fact when it comes as a new revelation of its god, simply has the wrong god. Any such church of any name is a liability, a drag, a millstone on the neck of every person and family in it. A church on this subject is out of its own field. For this reason we never hesitate to deal with it. When a church becomes a blind and a front for opposition to scientific discovery, for power politics nationally or internationally, then it has forfeited benefit of clergy and that reverence we traditionally give to religious organizations.

Someone has observed that there is precious little religion in "religious wars." One may just cross out the adjective. When a church leaves the field in which it might be authority, then it is to be dealt with as any organization that does not invoke reverence and sanctity. One need have no fear that any religious value is being threatened. This discovery has been here long enough to be as common and familiar as the telephone. Both are mechanical devices. This should have no moral connotations whatever. There is no more reason for birth control to be mixed up with our emotions, our priests, and our pastors, than there is for the telephone to be mixed up with them. It has been here long enough to have been incorporated into every Board of Health, medical school course, and nursing organization. One of the difficulties has been that doctors themselves were not authority on it as they were on other medical discoveries not theologically hot. If a medical school gets a dollar from city, state, or Federal taxes, it always lays itself open to the possibility of a taxpayer's suit. We saw a Planned Parenthood group living like a poor relation at the end of a hall in a medical school. It had to get out. It was forbidden to put a single line in a medical school catalogue to advise students that an optional course, without credit, was being given. The legal grounds for such legal action might be that it is the use of tax money for a controversial church matter, or it might be on the ground of obscenity and immorality. We are as far back legally as that.

We have reached the time when it is against public welfare not to require all nurses to clear a case in need of it to a Birth Control Clinic as a matter of course, just as she does to a Cancer Clinic. The time has come to say that a nurse who cannot do this in conscience is no longer competent for nursing. She is more of a church woman than a nurse which may be good for her church but is fatal for nursing. The same should be said about all social workers who run into situations that require clearing a family to a Birth Control Clinic.

We see people forced to collect money to bring this knowledge to a few people in privately supported clinics. They have to struggle along. It is lost motion now to have to collect money as a beggar to realize on a major scientific discovery of great benefit to our people. It is lost motion to have to support privately what should be on the tax bill and a "must" for every Board of Health. To force this situation upon us is not religion and it is not morality. It is just at this point that we become hesitant and apologetic. Such a stand by any institution, let alone a religious institution, is sheer impudence and that arrogant kind of bigotry that roots in ignorance. If immorality is to be measured by the number of people harmed, and we know of no other test, then withholding this knowledge is much more immoral than evils with the off-color reputation, street walking for example. The time has come not to defend but to attack, and to attack on this certain ground, that to oppose it is not good but thoroughly bad, and there is plenty of evidence in the very territory ruled by churches that shut out this knowledge.

We got ourselves into this jam through the fiction that religionists are the proper judges of morality and that morality somehow rests with them. This is hard to eradicate, as it was hard to eradicate the idea that religionists are the proper judges of healing and medicine. When we got rid of that, our health picked up at once. We are now in the stage of dropping the fiction that morality rests with religionists. Birth control is made a moral issue and called immorality. It is on this ground alone that the church claims jurisdiction.

It happens that morality has become almost synonymous with sex. That accounts for the disrepute into

which the word has fallen. Careful writers and speakers in the upper cultural brackets hesitate to use it at all. The word "moral" is more sexy than our fiction, theatre, and motion pictures. Our morality will clear up, as our health cleared up, when religion ceases to be thought of as the keeper and the judge of it. We should take the offensive on this ground that the sound morality of the thing, if we mean the only kind that matters, social morality, is almost wholly on the side of the birth control people.

It is unbelievable that a group in opposition can set the policy of Community Chests. Any group in opposition ought to be forced to go out and raise its own money. The time has come to reverse the policy. At present a group for birth control cannot get into the Community Chest. Both intelligence and social conscience demand now that no group should be in that opposes it.

Birth control with us is a case of arrested development. Other new causes go on rapidly through their minority period of education, with their small committee and a letterhead, their poverty-stricken office, and voluntary help. Any new cause expects to go through these birth pains but other causes soon grow out of it. Very soon they get into the Community Chest, get newspaper copy, get into the State Legislature, into the party platform, into Congress, and on the tax bill. Birth control has stuck at the first stage, pioneer education, starved budget, private money, and voluntary help. It does not even get into the Community Chest. It gets no copy that is not paid for at advertising rates. The opposition owns a lot of newspapers and scares a lot of others it does not own. Birth control is too hot for a politician until it is forced upon him. The time has come to force it upon him. Radio people say frankly that it is too hot for them. The small number of listeners who shut it out prevent the whole body of listeners from knowing about it. That is, the greatest of our inventions which puts knowledge on the wings of the wind is not allowed to use its set-up to say a word about another great invention of our age, birth control.

Just at present most people are panicky about their jobs, income, and general security. The opposition to birth control is just beginning a militant campaign to put itself on the map in America, as it was for a long time in Europe, with social results that are for warning rather than for imitation. Theological propagandists are not scrupulous about their methods. They are not averse to striking below the belt. They will go far in visiting harm of every kind upon all who oppose them. This is the record. They distribute, and have for centuries, more that is not true and helpful than Nazism, Fascism, and Russia combined. This is the over-all picture in which birth control is one little speck, called a black speck, down in the corner of the picture. The average person now is a victim of fears for his life. He has an eye on possible customers, clients, patients, and voters, and he is not doing anything to scare them away. Our American life is temporarily in the hands of the big manipulators, power business, and power politics. These usually have tied up with the most reactionary church groups.

The time has come for political action and it is long overdue. European countries have done it. Some of our own states have done it. It is always to be remembered that the opposition is a minority. It is the number of voters in a religious group of 25,000,000, many of them below the voting age. In a country of 140,000,000, a 25,000,000 minority is not a formidable opposition. A political party would not be paralyzed into inactivity with a 25,000,000 opposition if it was Tammany Hall or Kelly's crowd in Chicago. La Guardia, of good memory, likely beat more than that number of the Tammany Tiger stripe. The labor vote certainly is several times that number. Those who think they are practical politicians act like and say that they are not afraid of the labor vote. It is not the size of the opposition's vote. We deal with and beat other larger blocs of votes in every national election. It is not the size of the opposition. It is that it is a church group. The difficulty is not the numbers but the ecclesiastical atmosphere and the ingrained deference to churchmen. Anything they do is prima-facie right. A number of cities have cleaned out a larger number with more votes, but in the cities you often have something stinking to high heaven to help you. Here you do not have that. However much harm this church opposition is doing, and it is doing immeasurable harm, it does not stink to high heaven. It has the odor of sanctity and of church incense.

This movement now is ready for fighting politicians to pick it up. Doctors, clinics, private money, and private help have gone as far as they can go. The opposition has won so far by blackballing any candidate who is for it. As a matter of practical politics this situation could be reversed so that voters would scratch any candidate opposed to it. That could be done likely in ten years. On other subjects about as hot as this with theological implications, we have forced candidates to change sides in ten years. Voting for a thing was changed from a political asset to a political liability in that short time. The opposition puts on a bold front but it knows that it is not formidable. It has been beaten on every scientific issue in its history. It is scared for its life with the rest of us. The political technique now is to get bills into every State Legislature incorporating birth control into the health set-up. Rebels could be found to introduce such bills. Committee hearings would have to be picked up as news. Political action would force it into print.

There are always many people around who are just waiting for someone to speak *their* minds. They can be counted upon to fall on the better side as soon as they know more about it. It would be so in this matter. This is a good subject to go to the political mat on, for there is practically nothing to be said against it. We should be willing to trust it to popular vote, if people's information could be brought up to their intelligence.

We can produce now for an indefinite number of people. If one is going to be for unlimited birth production, he ought to be also for unlimited production of all that people live on. To be for scarcity in one's economics and to be for abundance in the production of people—these two positions simply do not go together or make sense. If one is going to be a theological reactionary and say "go to it, have all the children you can," then that person ought to be an economic liberal. If he is going to double the population, and we can do that, he ought to be for doubling what people have to have, and now we can do that. This is not an isolated subject, and certainly not so isolated as a theological subject. It is a part of what one thinks of the whole business of our living together.

When the Chips Are Down

JOHN W. BRIGHAM

There are times when it does not seem too important what you believe or how you act. Life flows pleasantly along; the fields are lush with corn, the fruit trees are laden with delectable rewards, the grass springs green in the spring, and the snows of winter have left their melting water deep in the heart of the land. There is sunshine and it is summer, and the sweet lethargy of a quiet mind is the chiefest end of man.

But there come times when the fields are sere and dry, the fruit has been blasted by late frost, the grass turns brown in late June, and not enough snow fell in winter to even wet the soil with its moisture.

Then the chips are down, and the fight is on, the fight for life and existence; the battle is hard and the hands grow tough.

It is not always summer; it is not always springtime.

So it is with us. It was easy to belong to a church of a free faith, when freedom was the great pearl of life. There was a flowering of Unitarianism in those days, a flowering that reached its tendrils out to the west and established in our cities and towns the first roots of this religious movement.

The times have changed. Today, I do not know that you could originate a new Unitarian church on the whole New England landscape. I doubt if it could take root and grow in that penurious soil, where men are so beset with the needs and cares of daily life that little thought is commonly given to the faith behind freedom.

Freedom is on trial and a faith that is the foundation of freedom is sore perplexed and strained. Now the chips are down. We cannot bluff the dealer longer, we cannot give vain repetition to the words of faith and expect to carry the game forward any further. Now the fight is for existence and for life. Now must our minds be tough and our deeds be the strongest affirmation of the faith.

When the chips are down, it is what you hold in your hand that counts. When your religious faith is on test, it is what you do with the faith in life that tells and counts.

Now the lines are drawn. Within our churches as within the whole range of civil life, the lines are drawn more and more stringently. Those who believe in freedom and those who fear it.

And as the issues become steadily more plain, the painful truth, indeed I might say the painful horror, becomes more clear. For we find that that very basis of freedom, the concept of the dignity of man, has been shot at, hacked at, chopped at until more folks than not think of the individual person as quite without significant values. Prosperity has been a greater love than justice. Social status has been a higher good than intellectual honesty and forthright statement of conviction. Fear of rising tides of change has caused us to frantically deny the greatness in man, which is essentially the cause of all change.

A resurgence of the spirit of Calvinism, not the religion but the spirit, has seized the minds of men. This spirit acts on the supposition that human nature is sinful, profoundly and radically corrupt, that such men must be bound by ironclad laws and extreme punitive measures. It holds that men and women cannot be trusted to choose wisely, but must have their choices made for them; that you and I are not capable of determining our way, but must follow the line of the past. The excessive regulation of life, which was a dominant expression of the Calvinistic temper in Geneva, has its modern counterpart in the police state, and in our own nation to a considerable extent.

Now that the chips are down, we must decide. We of the free churches, we of the liberal faith, must decide. Do we go along with the prevailing concept of man's innate inability, or shall we in ever more resounding terms pronounce an ever-insurgent faith in the potential and the capacity of men and women? In Calvin's day we rose, that is the liberal spirit, rose to announce a confidence in man, to deny the original depravity of the human flesh, to assert the close and harmonious association of human and divine in man himself.

In our day, when again the die is cast, we must reassert in new and modern terms the fundamentals of the free man's faith.

What are these fundamentals? Can you express them? If you were asked suddenly, "What are the fundamentals of a liberal religious faith?" could you give them clear, concise expression? There are two that are really basic. More may flow from these, but they are secondary, though undoubtedly important.

When the chips are down, the two fundamental beliefs which undergird a liberal faith are these: A belief in progress and a belief in toleration.

The belief in progress is a natural consequence and growth from the conviction that man is not originally depraved. The belief in progress is a belief of hope and a fighting faith. It underlies the poetry of Shelley, the act of Socrates who discussed the immortality of the soul as he prepared to drink the hemlock, the words of Jesus as he hung upon the cross: "Father forgive them, they know not what they do." The notion of progress is supported by the evidence of life itself. It is not a vain and prideful belief.

To be sure, it has sometimes degenerated into a fatalistic optimism, as for instance in the phrasing which was common in many of our churches for a number of years: "Progress of mankind, onward and upward forever." There is no proof that progress follows any such straight and simple line, and indeed no clear meaning is found in either the word onward, or upward.

It was unfortunate, I believe, that this phrase ever became current in our churches, for it conjured up a notion of gradual and inevitable progress, which progressively became more difficult to maintain. After facing two World Wars in one generation, after having secured two victories and having failed twice to achieve the objectives of wartime hopes, one's confidence in inevitable progress is a little dashed.

But you can rid your mind of the idea of inevitable progress, and still hold to the fundamental faith in progress. The strength of such a faith lies not in its inevitability, but in its possibility.

The strength of this fundamental belief is that it makes requirements of us,—among them the requirement that we acknowledge that we do not possess final truth, either in religion, in economics, in politics, or

in any facet of social organization. This requirement makes us run counter to the convictions of many men and women, influential men and women, and some social institutions as well.

A second requirement of this belief in the possibility of progress is that we are committed to truth-seeking. Only lovers of freedom are truth seekers. The others believe that they have truth already in its final form. Conservatives and Communists alike no longer search for truth. They have it. Peddlers of racial or national hatreds are not truth seekers. They already have it, so they say. But the liberal and the liberal church does, like Ulysses, "determine to follow knowledge like a sinking star, beyond the utmost bound of human thought."

A freedom-loving person, a truth seeker, a true man or woman of the liberal temper and spirit moves forward, because he contains within himself self-correcting principles that permit adoption of new knowledge and correction of past errors, without overthrowing the foundations of his life.

The Unitarian churches, the men and women of our free faith, committed to this belief in progress, will find that they are more than Christian. They will find themselves a part of the great stream of life which, from ancient China and the East to Palestine and the West, has given finest expression to life and human aspiration. They belong to a universal fellowship, a comradeship of ages and of all truth seekers.

Now let us look at the second of these fundamental principles, the belief in toleration. You know, toleration requires a certain amount of skepticisim in one's system. What does tolerance mean? It means that we will give our enemies a chance. Now this is most difficult. It is the blow on the cheek.

When events move smoothly and life does not press in on us, toleration is comparatively easy. But under strain, under pressure, the expression of tolerance is a bitter task. How difficult and how bitter is being seen in the civil and political life of nation after nation today. Nor has it been less difficult in religion. But the liberal spirit requires toleration, and upon a very sound basis. First of all, because we are aware that we do not have the whole of truth, and because we are conscious that even among our enemies there may come to light a portion of the truth of life which we most desperately need. We recognize that on the whole in the conflict of opinions and ideas, more truth will come in free and open encounter than if there be suppression.

We cannot speak of this belief in toleration honestly, without recognizing the rarity of its appearance, and the difficulties involved in its expression. Any person, even a Unitarian, who thinks he knows the absolute truth, sees very little reason for tolerating another point of view. Just as a Catholic will not admit that a Unitarian is a Christian, so a Unitarian finds it difficult to think of Hindu polytheists as being very enlightened.

Tolerance thrives apparently in persons who have the ability to see affairs and events with considerable detachment. I do not mean that a tolerant person must separate himself from the activities of life. But he must, as with Emerson, be able to lift his mind above the melee and see the humor, as well as the tragedies, of life. Morris Cohen observed in a very enlightening essay on the future of American Liberalism that "since a generous stock of ignorance is one of the fundamental equipments with which the creator has endowed all human beings, tolerance will always be a rather rare phenomenon." It is inherently frail and, as today when the chips are down, tolerance tends to vanish from the scene.

Its great enemy is, of course, fanaticism,—fanaticism being the terrific and torrential impatience with contradiction or opposing views. Fanaticism abhors freedom as from the devil. Intense hatred and fear of any deviations, a love of conformity, these are the idols of the fanatic. And these are the idols of a rather considerable section of the present American public.

As this development has grown, the liberal religious men and women have discovered that they must reexamine the foundations of their faith, strengthen the underpinning, prepare for the axmen of left and right who are bearing down upon our grove of rational thought and life.

It was hastily concluded by some of the brethren to the right and left that liberalism was dead a few months or years ago. Not only was this conclusion much too hasty, it was quite without foundation. We must understand this, that the extremists who wield their polemic hammers through the ether and the press rarely show enough reason in their thought to provide foundation for any substantial conclusion.

The spirit of free inquiry, free discussion, flexibility, and accommodation to steadily revealing truth is not dead or even dying.

I am sure that the emphasis of liberalism must change, and that change is already under way. The inevitability of progress, the onward and upward concept, is hardly in accord with recent understanding of evolving man. Inevitability has given way to possibility,—the possibility of human advance in moral understanding, in "universal concepts," in tolerance and freedom. This is the growing understanding of the free and rational man.

The foundation of this life is firm beneath our feet, the goal of this life is still high above our vision. Between these two we live and move, and the possibility of upward growth is with us.

These are uneasy days, the uneasiness is in men's minds. The old rocks of orthodox faith have crumbled fast in recent years. Folks have tumbled into a feverish search for security. They cannot find it on the old terms. We offer a faith that is secure because it is open at the top to receive every advance of scientific truth as well as intuitions that flow with every new discovery.

Orthodoxy is crumbling fast. A fascinating symptom of it is the increasing tempo of church unions and mergers. They seek security in numbers, greater numerical strengths, vaster treasuries. It is but an indication of the uneasiness which pervades the minds of clergy and of laity.

I forget now who said this originally, but he likened orthodoxy to a great ship, which in the great storm, was driven on the shore and wrecked, while liberalism is a raft, and, though our feet are always wet, we ride out the roughest storm.

It is not life which is important, it is a good life. This was a motto of the Greeks. Much of current opinion runs contrary to that expression. The reason the Catholic church opposes birth control, is the assumption that life is sacred and no human being should tamper with the gates of life or death. With us, this

is not so. With us life is important only as the condition and the opportunity for the development of good life, and I think we would prefer not to live, if it were as slaves or in degradation.

There is great temptation to predict the future. I control myself and limit my observation to this. History has no end. It is a continuum of action and reaction. There is no one force acting, there are many. Life is a process in history, a process of growth and decay. We have no interest, no desire in halting this process. We want to live that the growth may be of greater moment for human lives than the decay.

It may be at the end we shall know God. But in the meantime I am content to search for Him in every nook and cranny, to find a trace here where His presence may be suggested, to find there an evidence that He preceded me, and to know in lives of men and women that there are moments which lift them out of ordinary concerns and project their hopes and aspirations to far distances.

The chips are down in the whole world today. The battle for your mind is on.

Declaring for Color and Resigning from a Myth*

KENNETH L. PATTON

I

The theme, "Declaring for Color," occurred to me while reading *Kingsblood Royal,* the novel on racial discrimination by Sinclair Lewis. In this book Neil Kingsblood, a prominent member of the "white" business and society world, discovers that he is part Negro, and after a series of incidents declares his ancestry and joins the Negro people.

The story interested me partly because there is some American Indian ancestry in our family. I confess that I tend to be as proud of my "colored" Indian blood as that I am a quarter Irish, with additions of French, English, Dutch, and German. At one time we had a full-blooded Persian cat and Springer spaniel in our household, and I commented that they were the only full-bloods. The rest of us were mongrels. In fact, there are no "pure" races among human beings. We are all of mixed racial parentage. Our primitive ancestors did not stay put. They roamed the earth, and as they roamed they intermarried. There is not only the platinum blonde Norwegian and the deep black Negro, but there is every shade of tan in between. There are all gradations of Caucasian and Mongoloid characters. Scientists have estimated that it would take seventeen generations of intensive inbreeding to produce a human strain that would breed true. Nature has decreed that there are no penalties for the crossbreeding of so-called human races. There are indications that strains are invigorated in the mixing of different races. The vigor of our own melting pot nation may be partially due to the mixing of races and nationalities we find here.

Is there any such thing as a white race? Why do we get a sun tan? The skin seems to protect itself against sun burn by calling up the help of the pigment in the skin. The heavier our pigmentation, the darker we become. Many of us get much darker after a summer on the beach than many whom we call colored people. We might ask, when is color color and when is color not color? Obviously those who call themselves white have decided that their color does not count.

Painters use the term "flesh color." In the flesh tones of any so-called white person are all the colors of the palette, creamy and pearly colors, yellows, oranges, siennas, tints of blues and greens. The only persons who are really white are albinos, and an albino is as likely to be born into the Negro race as any other. Even the albino has pink eyes and a pinkish cast to his skin due to his red blood. The great bulk of us are truly colored people, some sallow, some peaches and cream, some olive, swarthy, yellow, brown or black or red, but it all adds up to more or less pigment. The Negro race might be said to have acquired a permanent sun tan, due to the need for pigment to resist the hot sun in the lands where they have lived.

During my life I have become increasingly disgusted at the behavior of the so-called white people into which group I was accidentally born. When in the South I stood in one line to get on a bus, while colored people stood in another line to take the back seats, when I sat in white waiting rooms or in white coaches, ate in white restaurants, I felt physically ill. Here where Madison real estate interests keep Negroes from renting or buying homes in most sections, where clubs bar Negro members, where the medical school of the state university makes it next to impossible for a Negro student to enroll, I become uncomfortable.

So I have decided to do something about it. I have some Indian blood which according to common prejudices makes me all Indian. Even without that, anthropologists assure us that all so-called white people are a mixture of many strains or races if one traces back far enough. I do not have to be a member of the "white" race if I do not want to be. I have decided to declare in favor of what color I have and join the colored people. I am "crossing the line" in the other direction, as Neil Kingsblood decided to do, and throwing my lot in with the colored peoples of the world. I do not tan as deeply as some, but I freckle. Sort of a spotty job, but I think I can muster enough color to make the grade.

What does this mean in practical behavior? One of the strangest indignities to which a minister is subjected is designating whether he is white or colored in filling out a form for a clergy passbook on the railroads. Preachers have the same privilege as children under twelve. They can ride for half fare. Even the clergy must be divided on color lines. It would not do for a colored minister to get into a white coach in the South. The next time I fill in a form of this kind I am going to fill it in colored, not white. Wherever such information is asked I shall answer colored. This is one way that "white" people can jam up the machinery whereby the silly and vicious discrimination is allowed to carry on.

If I ever try to buy property where there are restrictive covenants, I will insist that I am colored. If I am refused the right to purchase, I will yell long and loud.

[*Editor's Note:* The two radio addresses delivered by Kenneth L. Patton from Madison, Wisconsin, Sunday, September 14, and Sunday, September 21, 1947, are here printed in full as delivered over Station WIBA.]

I will continue, as in the past, to work for the right of colored people to own property and live in any part of town they desire or can afford. I will continue to work for the educational, economic, and social equality of all, regardless of pigmentation. In my activities as a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People I will not be working merely to promote the advancement and betterment of others, but of myself as a member of those designated as colored.

I would like to propose an organization to be called "The United Colored Peoples of the World" to be open to all people of color: Negroes, all Orientals and Islanders, American Indians, Eskimos, and all others, along with their less heavily colored brothers, the so-called "white" people who are tired of being called white, and have decided to move in with the colored. The United Colored Peoples of the World would thus be open to all who have decided to declare in favor of their color. It would only be gracious to invite all albinos to be associate members in full standing. This is a sincere proposal. Some organization such as the NAACP might adopt it as a promotional project. The discrimination now prevailing could not be easily carried on if a considerable number of the so-called whites decided to move across the line into the colored race.

The lightness of our hue would be a handicap, but we might resort to a few "colored" lies. When in a group where there is talk against the Negroes, we could say, "I am a Negro," or "I am a member of the colored race." An example occurred in a discussion where one woman asked, "What would you do if your sister married a Negro?" Another woman answered calmly, "She did." Somehow that ended the discussion. Perhaps a distinctive lapel button could be worn to indicate membership in the United Colored Peoples of the World. By this means we could recognize other colored people regardless of their hue. If the emblem became well enough known, hotel clerks, theatre employes, restaurant keepers, railroad conductors, bus drivers, real estate operators, and all others who, willingly or unwillingly, work to separate the "white" sheep from the "colored" goats, could know us for what we are, and see that we received no privileges not the right of a colored person. If we insisted on sitting in the colored sections in theatres, eating in the kitchen in snobbish restaurants, sitting in Negro bleachers, Jim Crow cars, etc., we could make such division ludicrous and awkward to handle. We could also, working from the inside, help secure privileges for colored people equal to those of any man, which is our final goal.

If you would like to join the United Colored Peoples of the World just drop a card to the Unitarian Society, Madison 3, Wis., and we will inform you as to further developments. Just as the world cannot exist half slave and half free, it cannot long endure half "white" and half "colored." But we can unite as colored people and help promote a true brotherhood of man.

II

When I announced last Sunday morning that I was resigning from the "white race" to become one of the colored people, I did not think it was anything very new or startling. I have said the same thing many times before in other ways. I have considered myself as being no part of any "race" idea for many years, I have resigned from the "white race" because there is no such thing as a white race. I have only resigned from a myth, for the whole idea of a "white race" is a lot of silly nonsense. Who wants to belong to nonsense?

Let us say it in plain English. There is no "white race." There is no "Negro race." There is no "Indian race." There is no "yellow race." Race is a myth. Race is a lie. The whole idea of race differences and barriers standing between groups of men is a cause of bloodshed, fear and hatred. There is only one race, the human race, and all men belong to it.

Why did I resign from the "white race"? So I could join the human race. So I could declare myself to be a member of one simple human race, that one race which includes all men from the Negro to the Caucasian, from the Australian Bushman to the Eskimo. I am a man. That is all I am. There is color in my skin. If my skin is colored then I must be a colored man, whether I have a light or a dark color, a red or a yellow color. We talk about each other's complexion. Your complexion is your color. People say, "My, what a nice color you have this morning." Women buy different colors of powder and rouge, red lipstick and blue mascara to put on their faces. Their faces have some color, more or less, before they put on their paint. Does not this make them colored? Or does not the word color mean color anymore? The only white men are albinos, biological freaks without pigmentation.

I have resigned from the "white race" because the white part is a lie and the race part is a lie. You, housewife and mother, you are not white. You are colored. If you do not believe me, go look in the mirror and see what color your face is. You, factory worker, you are not a white man. White is white. Put a piece of clean white paper on the back of your hand. Is the color of the paper the same color as your skin? If it is you likely have leprosy. You, well-to-do society woman, you are not a white woman. You are a colored woman. You, banker, merchant, you are colored. Whether you are European, Caucasian, African, Englishman, Negro, Oriental, Chinaman, Catholic, Protestant—I do not care who you are or what you are—you are not white. You are colored, and if you do not believe me, go look for yourself.

I do not like being misunderstood, especially when it is about something important. One paper headlined, "Pastor 'joins' Negro race." I said no such thing. I would not quit one stupid race idea to join another. I said that I joined the united colored race of the world, because all men are colored and there is only one race.

Another paper misinterpreted the United Colored Race of the World as an organization to which only non-whites or non-Caucasians could belong, and that it implied that whites and non-whites were divided into two irreconcilable worlds. In fact I said nothing about an organization to which only the non-whites would be admitted. The United Colored Race of the World was proposed primarily as an organization which "whites" could join when they had become tired of the myth of the "white race" and had decided to join forces with the rest of colored humanity. The purpose was precisely to join the "whites" and the "non-whites" into a common brotherhood with a united program for combatting racial prejudice.

I fully agree with the editorial writer that we must do everything not to divide humanity into two worlds of "whites" and "non-whites." But the only way that we can break down the divisions that now exist

between those who are known as the colored people and those who *call* themselves white is for the "whites" to admit that they are not really white after all, that this whole business about being white is stupid and dangerous. If we would quit talking about ourselves as white, and talk only about differences in color, if we have to talk about differences at all, we could get together.

I resigned from the "white race" not to get publicity for myself. I neither expected nor wanted to be any spectacle. I resigned only to do my personal bit to bring humanity together, to wipe out the differences and antagonisms that have made of men the most brutal and murderous enemies of other men. Until we get rid of the race idea, the idea of white supremacy, or the supremacy of any other color or nationality, we can hope for little peace. There are other causes of strife and war, but racism is one of the worst.

My hope, and may it become the hope of all, is that men will begin to practice the brotherhood of man. This is the ideal of Jesus and Isaiah, of Lao-tzu, Motze and Buddha. We must become peacemakers. We must love one another. This may sound corny. It has been said too often and practiced too little, but it is just as much a crying need as ever. But first we must accept each other as brothers, members all of the same race. Perhaps we might better call the organization "The United Human Brotherhood," or just "One Human Race."

Although I did not want, and do not seek, publicity for myself, if by using my name and person, if by using publicity I can help kill the race ideas and help bring mankind together, I will not shun publicity. A minister is a person in public life. And what is my privacy, and what is your privacy, set against the need for brotherhood? If Jesus was willing to die on the cross to bring men a bit closer to love of their fellow men, I am not going to cry about getting talked about.

The letters we have received attacking colored people and any so-called white man who joins their struggle for equality and justice would convince you of the desperate need for uprooting race hatreds out of our lives and society. In Chicago there has just been race disturbance to drive Negroes out of a non-segregated Federal housing project; 1000 police were needed to prevent full-scale rioting. There are in Chicago, as in New York, Detroit, and Los Angeles, situations that might flame into bloody rioting any time.

Farther away thousands of Hindus and Moslems have slaughtered each other in religious warfare. We cannot forget the slaughter of the Jews in Europe. Racism is nasty, brutish business, and its long, dirty arms reach into Madison as into every city of the earth. There is anti-Semitism and discrimination against the Negro and Oriental in our city as in others.

I thought I understood the race problem. I had read the books. But I can testify after one week of this—that you nor I nor any man who has not been born into one of the groups that meets segregation and discrimination knows what these people endure. You do not know until you have been there. To put any man in a position of insecurity, to wound his pride and self-respect, to humiliate him with name-calling, with social ostracism and abuse, with poverty, job-discrimination, to make him a second-class citizen, is a crime against all decency and common humanity.

People have asked if I were not unfair to thus put my children in a position of possible embarrassment. But what about the children of the 15 millions in the minority groups? Is it unfair for colored parents to bear children because they will meet abuse and misery? How cruel can we be and still live with ourselves? Tom Paine said, "Wherever tyranny is, there is my country." Following him we can say, "Wherever men face persecution and discrimination, there is my race."

The Promise of Human Nature: Discipline or Love?

JOHN W. CYRUS

Considering that we regard ourselves as part of a Christian civilization, our belief in love as a creative force in civilized living has fallen to a low point. The discrediting of love is a phenomenon of our times. It does not occur to us readily that we may have grown faint-hearted, that such use as we make of love is poor, but rather that love, whether between man and woman, or man and man, or in the wider ranges of social feeling, is misleading. We seem to be sure that wisdom and practical sense stand quite apart from full and generous human emotions. We regard cynically unselfish action and speech, and scorn the serious word that people on one side of the world must cherish the welfare of people on the other. We are easily convinced that appropriating vast sums of money to feed millions of people is charitable nonsense; we weaken the logic of One World by saying that aid to other peoples must be arranged for only in terms consistent with self-interest; and we say that while the appropriation of vast sums of money for bombs, ships, and arms may not be an expression of love, it is certainly the part of practical wisdom and necessity.

On the other hand, voices everywhere tell us that what we need most in our world is order, discipline. The reasons are obvious. We are overwhelmed with the chaos of the world and the disorganization of individual lives. The breaking institution of marriage primarily needs discipline. The militant drive of the labor movement needs to be disciplined. The generations of our youthful men would benefit from militarization. The quarreling, hungry minorities of European nations must be restored to order as a condition of eating. Even the problem of peace, from this viewpoint, is the problem of establishing a coercive legal power over the nations.

Where does the better promise of human nature lie: in the concept of order and discipline, or in the discredited motive of love? Which is the better part of man's life?

There is a deeper reason why discipline is exalted and love is discredited in our world. It lies in the fact that human life is driven by crude hungers and wants, unselective passions and blind powers, and we are afraid of this aspect of ourselves. We are first of all like the newborn child who can neither see nor locate sound, and who fumbles for the breast with only the permeat-

ing consciouness of hunger. He is ravenous and rough and has no time for manners. Like him we remain the repository of direct animal demands. We have been taught shame and distrust of these. Two thousand years of Christianity have branded this original human nature evil, and even today while we smile upon the uncivilized antics of the infant, we call him "little sinner." He will carry to his mouth whatever might be food, he will eat anybody's food, he will nuzzle any breast, sit on any lap, smile at any villian who feeds him, and desert and forget his own parents in a day for anybody else who will do as well by him. In short, he is careless, he has no respect for property, he is promiscuous, credulous, and faithless.

It is this original nature of man which frightens us and, in a disordered time, strengthens the argument for discipline. This same fear enables us to discredit love. For love, for all that we think of it as the gift of heaven, is rooted profoundly in this same original human nature. We know this is true. Love does not descend upon the newly married couple as they stand before the preacher. They have found it in themselves in their intuition of a mutual need for each other and have brought it with them. Love of man for man does not originate in churches and strike the convert suddenly in the pew. He has already found it in himself and in the world, in an impulsive goodness of fellow creature to fellow creature. Parental love does not spring up at the moment of the infant's consecration or christening. It is conceived and discovered within the life of the family. Love is not sublime because it gathers about us all the qualities we have called spiritual; it is sublime because it unites the spiritual with the power and substance of the flesh. It abolishes the ancient separation between flesh and spirit, mind and matter. Perhaps the best argument for a physical resurrection of the dead is that disembodied spirits would be pretty cold fish. And so it is that while in pious mood we speak of love as spiritual and unearthly, in practical mood we discredit it because it is rooted in the flesh, related to instinct, born out of the original nature that we fear and have been taught to regard as selfish and evil.

This attitude is an anachronism, a hangover from medieval and ancient ideas of guilt and sin. But while it still dominates our thinking and feeling, there is today a body of solid scientific data and opinion to support a very different attitude toward our original nature. This fact and opinion support a friendly and hopeful attitude toward the original and spontaneous nature of man and lead to the conclusion that love is the one key to the problems of our crudeness, our waywardness, and our unpredictability.

According to this scientific picture of man the word most appropriate to explain our hungers and their urgent demands is not greed, but need. Why should we call people greedy who are simply hungry? They are needy. Why should we call people selfish who are simply in need? Selfishness is not the word that best describes the wish to sustain life. We cannot condemn as immoral the will to live. So all the instinctive and impulsive drives we are born with indicate simple and real needs, for which there ought to be possible satisfactions.

Furthermore, says science, you cannot build social personality—persons who are regardful of other persons—except on satisfied needs. Social order or social discipline cannot be supported by the denial of elemental needs and hungers, but only on the real promise of satisfying them. You cannot end rape or criminal assault by outlawing sex. Shall one try to teach manners to a child who sits daily at a table on which there is no food, or almost none? It is an absurd notion. The purpose of the discipline of manners is to distribute fairly not scarcity but plenty. Even greed, our scientific data tell us, is a disguised form of need. We substitute one satisfaction for another. We ask for more than enough of one thing because we do not get enough of something else. The glutton stuffs his full stomach because he feels a vacancy elsewhere of body or soul which he cannot fill.

So love, at last, is the key to our deepest and crudest nature, for it is the part of love to accept, to honor, and to supply the need of another person. And so, too, love is itself as necessary to man as food is. That is to say, we need to feel and to know that our needs are not scorned but accepted, not despised or condemned, but readily acknowledged. We learn how to love only in connection with the satisfaction of our deep needs, which is to say that we learn to love only in returning love we have already experienced.

This, we must see, is a far cry, a long thought, from our fear of raw human nature and the doctrine of human sinfulness, from which we now reason that what we need most in the world is discipline. Generosity always apprehends this dimly; it does not spank first, it supplies. And it is interesting in this connection that the slogan of Father Flanagan, "There is no such thing as a bad boy," cuts right across the Catholic and Protestant doctrine of an evil human nature.

Moreover, for our time it raises a profound question about our whole attitude toward our troubled world. I have said that we have discredited love and have exalted discipline for its ills. The question is this: Do we propose to force discipline upon a world which perhaps is not nearly so undisciplined, wild, and unpredictable as it is simply hungry—for food, for shelter, for peace, for trust, and for love?

But now we must acknowledge another reason why love is discredited and discipline is endorsed. It is so often the masters of society who preach discipline and order, and they preach it to support a status quo, an orthodoxy, a prevailing system, and to keep themselves in office. Their notion of discipline and order is the kind of discipline and order that men have formerly lived by. But the elemental nature of man is always mocking and insulting that orthodoxy, that prevailing order. It always wants to chuck a snowball at a top hat. To be sure, this revolutionary tendency is often blind and crude and cruel. Doubtless this is one of the chief reasons why the church has so often stood against revolutionary movements, even democratic revolutionary movements. And certainly it is the reason why the church has dealt so mercilessly with its own revolutionaries, its heretics. Yes, raw human nature is revolutionary. The elemental drive of sex will wreck marriage and violate its codes. The elemental drive of hunger for food will violate the disciplines of property and patriotism, smash the window of a store or attack the houses of the state itself. Our elemental needs are not placid, not obedient, not orthodox.

Well, love is unorthodox and revolutionary, too. With no deed or plan of violence it will eat away at the foundations of traditional order, it will quietly break the established social disciplines, it will flout and cross the conventional barriers of society. Love is always a revolution when it is great but, unlike the wild violence of the raw impulses of men, it works with a great purpose and with a discipline of its own.

If this sounds like wild talk, consider the great exemplar of love in its full power. The conflict between the Empire, the legal and the military instrument of ancient order, and Jesus, the man of love, was an inevitable conflict. The conflict between the Temple, the high institution of orthodox religion and its disciplines, and Jesus, child of the temple, was an inevitable conflict. The fury of that conflict had only begun to gather with his death.

But let that ancient world go. What about ours and our lives in it? Surely this is not the world love has made or would make. Nor is this the world love would preserve. Not these fanatical nationalisms, this wide war psychosis, these spreading fears of one people for another, this spawning hate of group for group. Love in all its power would erase the names of nations, the labels of social dogma, the identity of separate peoples. Love would mingle the races in fairness, would end the manufacture of death, and keep men's blood in their hearts. Love would take you and me across boundaries we have never crossed, and take us without fear.

But discipline, order—without love—would do none of these things. Mostly it would prevent them, delay their coming. For many of these marks of a world of hate are part of the discipline and order we know. No, discipline, order, without love, will do little for our shameful woes. For discipline without love is only traditionalism. Some it would preserve, and some increase, and some it cannot prevent. For this world that love has not made, discipline has no salvation. Only remaking will redeem it. This world that love has not made will be destroyed, and the major question that tests us all is whether love or hate will destroy it and then rebuild it.

Now love as a motive for life and for the world's remaking is discredited not only by realistic, practical conservatives and traditionalists. It is discredited as well by revolutionaries, by men as eager for a different world as love is eager. They talk of it as a kind of fixed quantity in life which is far too small to take into serious account, and with a limited power far too weak to use. This is to misunderstand life and love utterly. Nothing varies more from day to day in your life and mine than the quantity and the power of love. Its flow as we know it is erratic, making us one day all lover and unconquerable, whether lovers of mankind or of our mates, and making us the next misanthropes and husband- or wife-haters. And nothing varies more in quantity or power in the world than love. Comb the world with fear and war, cross it with starvation, crush it into slavery, and love grows weak and small. But bring it peace, and food, and freedom, and love grows great. Which is to say, love grows in its own works and only in its own works. Jesus said men would see times when most of their love would grow cold, and Paul hastened to fix the only limit of its strength, its quantity, and its power. Love, he said, will never die out. That is because human nature is its home, not its prison.

It is part of human nature's promise still. We do not know what love could do if we gave it freedom. We may not find out. But it is the fountain, the one water of life, and the promise of human nature is that we may go to the fountain, and go to the souls who have drunk it deeply.

Religion Versus the History of Religion

EDMUND A. OPITZ

History is not kind to the cherished opinions of any one generation of men. Its record is crammed with instances of men born out of season. Their contemporaries misunderstood them, mistreated them, and often conferred upon them the distinction of martyrdom. It is instructive to read back into the history of our own country and note the vilification with which their own generations smeared three of our greatest Americans: Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. It is almost certain that Washington's retirement from public life was hastened by unfounded criticism. We exalt these men, but does our appreciation of them mean that we are so much smarter than our ancestors? Not at all. It means that we have whittled them down to schoolbook size so that we can patronize them, while at the same time we, in our turn, regard men who manifest their spirit as enemies of society. We appreciate great men —the dead ones, that is!

Sometimes a great man enters history only after his disciples have watered down his original doctrines into commonplaces. He himself is a great force who catches a vision of things as they might be, and then orders himself and tries to order his society for the furtherance of that vision. A man named Francis was born in 1189, the son of a well-to-do merchant. During his youth he was one of the gay irresponsibles about town, living in a society which was comfortable and complacent, with a church which was settled into a routine institutionalism. This institutionalism had produced some great things, not only in stone but in the realms of the human spirit. But it needed something without which things decay; notably, sincerity, simplicity, and discontent with itself. Unless these things be present, no growth is possible in men or in institutions. Francis pondered the life and teachings of Jesus and decided that his contemporaries were leaving out the most important things. The story of how he left his father's home, exchanged his rich clothes for the rags of a beggar, and adopted a life of poverty is well known. He drew around him a group of men and women who lived on what others willingly gave them, and who took to the highways to preach the original words of Jesus and live in his spirit. Francis had no intention of founding an order, still less of becoming an effective instrument of the Papacy. But the order was founded and grew in numbers. It achieved power and became wealthy. Acclaiming the person of Francis it tended to ignore his teachings and his spirit. Less than a century after Francis' death, according to Coulton, four of his friars were publicly burned at Marseilles "for adhering with heretical obstinacy to their master's first ideal of poverty." A great man

makes other men see what they have it in themselves to become and to be. For a while they breathe a purer and more rarefied air, but gradually the upright posture tires them. For a while, they are—to borrow a line from Keats—"tiptoe upon a little hill," but then, like the trained bears who amuse us for a time by roller skating around the stage, they lumber off on all fours.

In Thornton Wilder's play, *The Skin of Our Teeth,* the hero comes back from the wars. He says:

> I feel like all those people dancing around the bonfires,—just relief. Just the desire to settle down; to slip into the old grooves and keep the neighbors from walking over the lawn. But during the war—in the middle of all that blood and dirt and hot and cold—every day and night, I'd have moments when I *saw* the things we could do when it was over. When you're at war you think about a better world; when you're at peace you think about a more comfortable one.

Heroism excites us for a time, but then like the pull of gravity upon us comes the powerful desire just to vegetate.

There is no better casebook to illustrate this sort of thing than the Old Testament. Here is the story of a people more aware than most that religion imposes obligations on them. Their god demanded of them certain things. Also they were a clever people, and in response to the human law which says that men tend to satisfy their desires in the easiest fashion, they decided to lump all their religious obligations into one which they could discharge without any inconvenience to themselves. They would burn a calf upon an altar and be relieved of any further responsibility in the matter. They had a class of hirelings who took care of these affairs and saw to it that religion did not interfere with people's private lives. But just as they settled back comfortably, along would come some rascal prophet to denounce them and say that God did not care a hoot about sacrifices, what He wanted was justice, righteousness, a humble and a contrite heart.

The messages of the prophets were varied, but the core of them all was the assertion that religion is a living force and not an embalmed practice. This living force smites men mightily, religious literature is full of instances; it arouses an instinctive response—a gesture to recapture the incident, or to memorialize it. This may take the form of a rite of some sort. The individual then performs the rite in an effort to recover the frame of mind from which it initially sprang. Then along comes some blockhead who knows nothing of the experience, sees only the rite, and confuses it with religion. Thus a practice which arose out of an individual's experience with a living force is taken over by a people who are blind to its origin. Unaware of its origin, routine practice of the ritual effectively insulates them from contact with the vital thing which is religion. Falsely calling certain outward acts religion, their faces are turned backward to the time when these acts originated and they are blind to those men in their midst through whom the religious impulse is manifested for their own time. They are immersed in the history of religion and that is the subtlest and most insidious enemy that religion faces. When a prophet arose in their midst and tried to pound this idea through their thick skulls they stoned him and then piously erected the stones into a monument for some man their fathers had murdered.

Religion is a living force, and if a person is sensitive and aware it may break in upon him at any time. But if he is smug and complacent he will never experience it; and there is nothing that so makes for smugness and complacency as immersion in the old mummified forms of religion. It is religion versus the history of religion.

We have noted the tendency to glorify our historical figures only after they have been long dead. We have noted how a movement can so change that it exalts the person of the man who founded it while it kills those who try to practice what he taught. And we have seen the impact the prophets made upon the people of Israel and the terrible conflict between the prophetic insight and the way of all flesh. But the best illustration of the thesis that religion must war to the death against the history of religion, is the relation of Jesus to the Pharisees. His bitterest words of condemnation are reserved for this group.

Who were the Pharisees? What kind of men were they? You would have liked the Pharisees. Of all the groups in Palestine two thousand years ago, you would have liked them best. You would not have liked the Zealots, they were too violent. You would not have liked the Essenes, they lived a monastic life and withdrew from society. You would not have liked the priests because they were always doing messy things like killing animals for sacrifices. The Scribes always had their noses buried in a law book and were a dull and pedantic lot, with such notable exceptions as Gamaliel and Hillel. The Saducees were a hardshell bunch who were conservatives in the worst sense. But the Pharisees were people just like us, and we like people to be like ourselves.

The Pharisees are not mentioned in the Old Testament; they were a group which arose about four centuries before our era after the Exile and the breakdown of the Hebrew monarchy. Their name is taken from the Hebrew word meaning "separate," because they carefully nurtured the idea of the Hebrews as a people unique among the nations. They were super-patriots, hundred per centers. They took over the guidance of the nation and made of it a community that was half-state, half-church. They were intelligent statesmen. They popularized the idea of monotheism, and fostered the messianic consciousness of their people. They looked for the advent of a savior who would restore their nation to the glory it once had. The Pharisees were an aristocracy, but of talent, not of birth. They had a serious purpose, they were sincere, intelligent, respected, respectable, solid, and self-assured. They knew what religion was; it was what it had always been and always would be until the Messiah came. They were active churchmen.

Jesus came upon the scene. He passed up these good people and consorted with publicans and sinners. He needed some men to carry out his mission, but not one of the men he chose as his instruments came from this group, the Pharisees. What was wrong with the Pharisees? Nothing was wrong with them, and that was their trouble! They were complete and complacent; but to be complete is to be finished. They had arrived; but to have arrived means that the Life Force had discarded them at the end of a blind alley. The Creative Will could not use them because they were stagnant. They made the colossal blunder of assuming that the Will of God had spoken to men centuries before them and had nothing more to say.

I think it was Emerson who remarked that if you point a straw with the current the Gulf Stream will flow through it. If a man is properly oriented, the Creative Purpose will flow through him. But if he lies across the current he causes a jam. Jesus passed up the Pharisees because he saw that sin and imperfection,

with their self-criticism and their humility, are far less dangerous to life than complacency; for sin might pave the way for an inner change which would raise life to a higher pitch than blameless respectability can ever reach. And so Jesus went to the men who were not quite achieved, who were not very wise, who were a little mad, who were slightly possessed. He came to call the sinners, not the righteous to repentance, because the righteous were hopeless. They were in no need of a physician; they needed an undertaker!

In one of the incidents recounted in John, the Pharisees sent officers to arrest Jesus. They returned empty-handed saying, "No man ever talked as he does." The Pharisees answered, "Have you been imposed on too? Have any of the authorities or of the Pharisees believed in him? But these common people who do not know the Law are doomed." Jesus came to men who were searching, and not men who were sure they had found. The keynote of his message is contained in his brief phrase, "Seek and ye shall find," and in such parables as that of the merchant searching for the perfect pearl. The seeker is such an instrument as the Creative Purpose can use. The man who gives up the search under the illusion that he has found all the answers, lies at right angles to the direction taken by the Will of God; he obstructs it or it passes him by.

The Pharisees knew all the answers, and that was their trouble. But if there is any generation which has out-Phariseed the Pharisees it is ours. They were students who pondered their ancient lore, but we know everything without ever having learned anything. We know everything simply because we had the good sense to be born into the twentieth century. Like the Pharisees, *we* have given up the search. We have got our religion whipped into shape so that it is causing us no inconvenience. We are not tempted to steal, and neither were the Pharisees. We are practically without sin, and so were they. Their religion was formal and so is ours. We are not annoyed by our faith, it is not burdening us with excessive idealism. Wherein do we differ from anyone else in our judgments in politics, in business, in international relations? What is the distinctive thing about the Christian life or the religious life which marks it off from the life of the non-religious person? Not many who adore the person of Jesus and who say, "Lord, Lord," will enter the kingdom, but only those who are serious about the way of life which Jesus tried to impart. And that is a way of life which is simple, sincere, and discontented with itself, ever searching for new intimations of the living force of religion and always dissatisfied with its dead forms.

For we are such stuff as dreams are made of. We are entangled in the infinities. The wider universe is always trying to break in upon us if we would but give it a chance. We have an instinct for it, a yearning for it that is unappeasable. "For Thou has formed us for Thyself," said St. Augustine, "and our hearts are restless until they find rest in Thee." But always the history of religion, its fossil remains, crowds in and provides a comfortable resting place for the mind that desires such things. May we fight off this tendency, and keep ourselves ever sensitive to the stirrings within us and the living forces without, sensitive to the demands of religion upon us for this day!

The Study Table

Two Great Writers for All Mankind

HORACE. *By Alfred Noyes. New York: Sheed and Ward. 292 pp. $3.50.*

THOMAS JEFFERSON: CHAMPION OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM. *By Henry Wilder Foote. Boston: Beacon Press. 70 pp. $1.25.*

Two books appear at the same time dealing with two writers who lived long ages apart, but whose influence will remain as long as men read books. The poet, Alfred Noyes, says "it is with Horace, the lover of life, the friend of poets, the wise adviser of so many different kinds of men, that my book is engaged." Precisely the same words might be said about Jefferson. They were alike in other ways: Horace will always be associated with the peace of the Sabine Farm as Jefferson will with his Virginia Farm and his hope that America would remain the abode of small farmers. Both were concerned with government and with letters. Horace's famous lines, "this was what I had prayed for, a few acres of land, a garden, a spring of water flowing near the house and, above and behind these, a patch of woodland," might just as well have come from Jefferson's pen. Both men hated strife and bloodshed. Both loved freedom and independence of spirit. Noyes' *Horace* is a biographical sketch of great beauty, taking the poet from childhood through his education at Athens and by various travels to his Sabine Farm and to court. But the Sabine Farm was the spot Horace loved most, and there he wrote the epistles and poems and the "Art of Poetry" which will live, as he himself said, after all these things of bronze have gone back to dust. Noyes thinks that Horace may have approached closely to the New Ruler who was coming into the Roman Empire as he left it. The issues with which Horace dealt are still with us, as are those of Thomas Jefferson.

Although Jefferson died in 1826, the issues of his thought are still debated. Hence this book on Jefferson is timely and should be carefully read, as it traces his religious thought from his Episcopalian youth through his education at William and Mary College at Williamsburg where he began the independent thinking which he kept up all his life. The early foreign influence on his thought was French. He always clung to "the morals of Jesus" as the basis of Christianity and thus anticipated the "back to Jesus" movement of the twentieth century. Later in his life he came under the influence of English Unitarian thought and adopted the teaching of the great scientist-theologian, Joseph Priestly, who not only discovered oxygen but also rediscovered the teaching of Jesus in a time when dogma stifled the simplicity of the Sermon on the Mount. The necessary corollary to Jefferson's religious thought was the enunciation of the American principle of separation of Church and State. Today this principle is again in peril, and once more we need to study Jefferson. Shakespeare was translating Horace when he wrote these words which apply equally to Horace and Jefferson:

Not marble, nor the gilded monuments
Of princes shall outlive this powerful rhyme.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

ADDITIONAL NEWS

With this issue the Western Unitarian Conference is using two pages for its materials and news notes. This will be done regularly or from time to time as feasible. Let us hope that churches in the Conference will take advantage of this opportunity to send in such information and ideas as they feel would contribute to our Unitarian progress.

A STATEMENT ON THE FREE UNITARIANS

The following statement, prepared by Dr. James Luther Adams and Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, has been signed by a large number of people from the Western Conference and representative Unitarians throughout the country. It was officially approved by the Minnesota Unitarian Conference at their annual meeting in September and by the Board of the Western Unitarian Conference in its meeting on September 29:

"A group of Unitarians has recently charged that our leadership 'has shown more concern for social service, political and legislative propaganda than for the spiritual side of religion' and that, 'knowingly or unknowingly, it has been encouraging, or at least tolerating, Communistic ideology, materialistic, naturalistic, and humanistic philosophies detrimental to Unitarian Christianity.' This group would 'safeguard' the American Unitarian Association, the organizations affiliated with it, and the local churches, by 'the elimination' of these and other similar philosophies which, they allege, are 'likely to destroy religion and the American way of life.' In support of these views the group appeals to the stated purposes of the American Unitarian Association as set forth in its by-laws: 'To diffuse the knowledge and promote the interests of pure religion, which, in accordance with the teaching of Jesus, is summed up in love to God and love to man.'

"The undersigned Unitarians call the attention of this group to the concluding sentence in the stated purposes of the Association as set forth in the by-laws: 'The Association recognizes that its constituency is congregational in tradition and polity, and that nothing in these by-laws is to be construed as an authoritative test.' In demanding 'the elimination' of all philosophies distasteful to them, this group is ignoring the congregational tradition and polity of our churches as recognized and safeguarded in our by-laws. By its authoritarian appeal the group violates the distinctive genius of our movement. Reliance upon such a proposed purge, rather than upon our traditional way of keeping our movement clean and virile by the interplay of sincere conviction held by honest men and women, would be the surest way to destroy not only 'the American way of life' but also 'pure religion.' There is no place in 'pure religion' for the Grand Inquisitor.

"Nor is pure religion 'pure spirituality.' Spirit creates and molds. The essence of Unitarianism has always been the application of religious and ethical insight to the practical issues of common life, for the creation and constant re-creation of the forms of society. Those who would dissociate spirituality from these concerns emasculate religious faith—the trust in those forces that make for love and justice in history and community. Concern for social service and for political and economic justice is the sign of love to God and love to man. It is an essential expression of 'the spiritual side of religion.' There can be no neutrality in these matters. Silence or inaction are themselves forms of action; they betray democracy and liberal religion by default. And neutrality is often a concealed way of taking sides. Do the 'Free Christians' mean to deny the validity of the Christian social reform impulse, manifested by Channing, Parker, S. J. May, Francis G. Peabody, and Arthur L. Weatherly?

"Among those signing this document are theists, religious naturalists, and Humanists; some have approved and some have disapproved the recent dismissal of the Editor of the *Christian Register;* some are ministers, some are laymen and laywomen; and all sections of the continent are represented. But we are firmly united in our loyalty to our *free* faith, to the commanding vision of prophetic religion, and to the Unitarian Church as the Fellowship of this freedom and the servant of this vision.

"We call upon the leadership of the American Unitarian Association to continue its fidelity to these principles which the 'Free Unitarians,' 'knowingly or unknowingly' threaten."

WORTH THINKING ABOUT

Do Men Gather Grapes of Thorns?

"The backward view often makes things look so simple,
Much too simple.
When I heard that a certain youth had confessed the theft
For which he had been arrested,
I reproached myself for my lack of action
When, years ago, I saw him 'going wrong'.
Condemning his wealthy guardian for lack of understanding
In giving the boy too much money and too many lectures
Did not relieve my self-condemnation.
How the other boys envied his freedom, his allowance,
The car he drove years before his friends might drive!
He had no parents to restrict him,
No responsibilities to trouble him!
Today he is in jail, having fulfilled the requirements
For entrance into the college of crime.
It is now too easy, and too late,
To blame a broken home, or an indulgent guardian,
Or any of the many things a backward view reveals
As the soil in which the roots of this boy's character
Were nurtured.
His warped and twisted view of life was not an accident.
It grew ont of the life of the community
As naturally as weeds among the flowers in our garden;
Probably for the same reason—our neglect."

Edwin C. Palmer.

NEWS NOTES

Alton, Illinois. The church was completely redecorated this summer, both the auditorium and the vestry. The auditorium is now a rare "thing of beauty." The church performed an interesting and successful experiment by putting on its financial drive in August, going over the top on both the local budget and the United Appeal. The Church School has grown to such proportions that they have found it necessary to rent rooms in the Y.W.C.A. a block down the street.

Ann Arbor, Michigan. Contracts have been let for the building of a new parsonage adjacent to the church house.

Bloomington, Illinois. The church put on a series of three lectures which they called "The Liberal Institute." The speakers were Harold Marley of Dayton, Ohio, Kenneth L. Patton of Madison, Wisconsin, and Kenneth Walker of the Bloomington Church.

Dayton, Ohio. The church is sponsoring a Sunday afternoon radio broadcast. It is conducted on the round table method and originates in the church parlors with participants and visitors seated around the fireplace.

Grosse Pointe, Michigan. Miss Florence Baer has been employed as Parish Assistant and Church Secretary. Miss Baer was formerly Assistant Director of the Department of Unitarian Extension and Church Maintenance of the American Unitarian Association.

Lincoln, Nebraska. The church has called the Reverend Philip Schug. Mr. Schug will begin his ministry on December 1. For the past four years he has been minister of the Unitarian church at Urbana, Illinois.

Louisville, Kentucky. Rev. G. Theodore Hempelmann, minister of the Clifton Unitarian Church, is also serving as associate to Rev. Robert T. Weston of the First Unitarian Church.

Minneapolis, Minnesota. Rev. George Marshfield is Director of the new student group on the campus of the University of Minnesota. It is known as the Tri-U (Unitarian, Universalist, University). This project is supported by the Unitarian churches in Minneapolis and St. Paul, the Universalist Church of Minneapolis, the Minnesota Unitarian and Universalist Conferences, and the Division of Education of the American Unitarian Association.

Sioux City, Iowa. The blueprints and sketches of the new Unitarian church building for Iowa City have been completed. The new building is to replace the one destroyed by fire this last summer and will be located in a more advantageous portion of the city.

STATE CONFERENCES

During September and October three state conferences were held: the Minnesota, Michigan, and Iowa Conferences. The Minnesota Conference was the second one held since the war; the Michigan Conference met in Ann Arbor for the first time since the war; the Iowa Association held its 70th annual meeting in Des Moines. All were well attended. The revival of interest in state conferences is a hopeful feature of Unitarian advance in the Midwest.

INTRIGUING

We were intrigued by the sermon subject for October 19 at St. Paul. Arthur Foote preached on the subject "The Bible, the Baby, and the Bath Water."

ALL UNITARIAN DINNER

The All Unitarian Dinner sponsored by the Chicago Associate Alliance was held at Abraham Lincoln Centre on November 6. There was a record attendance of 150. The subject discussed was Palestine. The speakers were Professor Albert Howe Lybyer, who presented the Arab's position, and Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, that of the Zionist.

HONORING DR. SNYDER

WHEREAS, the Reverend Dr. Charles Edward Snyder has retired as minister of the First Unitarian Church of Davenport,

WHEREAS, thirty years of Dr. Snyder's thirty-nine years of distinguished service in the Unitarian ministry have been served in the area of the Western Unitarian Conference at Sioux City and Davenport, Iowa, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Snyder was for thirty years the efficient Secretary of the Iowa Unitarian Association, during which time he also served various terms on the Board of Directors of the American Unitarian Association, and of the Executive Council of the National Federation of Religious Liberals in addition to his outstanding chairmanship of numerous civic and educational committees and commissions; therefore be it

RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Western Unitarian Conference record its deep appreciation of Dr. Charles Edward Snyder's devotion and competence in the ministry of the church, the effectiveness and dispatch of his administrative gifts, the good will which he manifests in his relationships with his brethren, and his unfailing humor which enlivens all groups with which he is associated; and be it further

RESOLVED that this resolution be incorporated in the minutes of this meeting and a copy sent to Dr. Snyder together with the Board's greetings and best wishes.

—*Passed unanimously,*
September 29, 1947.

NEW BOOK

Albert Schweitzer: An Anthology. Edited by Charles R. Joy. Issued jointly by the Beacon Press and Harper & Bros. Price $3.75. Selections from the writings of Dr. Albert Schweitzer with biographical introduction and chronological summary of his life. Order through the Western Conference Book Store.